

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JS-6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IRAJ KHOSROABADI,

Plaintiff,

v.

**MAZGANI SOCIAL SERVICES, INC.,
MAHVASH MAZGANI, NAZANIN
MAZGANI, NEYAZ MAZGANI,
MAHNAZ MOGHADDAM, and
SHOHREH SHARIFZADEH,**

Defendants.

Case No.: SACV 17-00644-CJC(KESx)

**ORDER REMANDING CASE AND
DENYING DEFENDANTS' *EX PARTE*
REQUEST**


On March 13, 2017, Plaintiff Iraj Khosroabadi filed this case in Orange County Superior Court, which was removed to this Court on April 7, 2017. (*See* Dkt. 1 Ex. 1; Dkt. 1.) On February 14, 2018, the Court granted in part Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to Plaintiff's civil RICO cause of action, and declined to exercise

1 supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's remaining causes of action. (Dkt. 93.) The
2 Court delayed remand in light of Plaintiff's pending motions to compel discovery, and
3 Magistrate Judge Scott's request that the Court retain jurisdiction while the Social
4 Security Administration produced information responsive to Plaintiff's subpoenas. (Dkt.
5 96.)

6
7 Before the Court is Defendants' *ex parte* request for dismissal of the case or for an
8 order to show cause why the cause should not be dismissed in light of the parties'
9 purported settlement. (Dkt. 102.) Defendants represent that the parties entered into a
10 confidential settlement agreement on March 30, 2018, wherein Defendants agreed to pay
11 Plaintiff and Plaintiff agree to execute a stipulation for dismissal of this action with
12 prejudice. (*Id.* at 2–3.) Defendants did not attach the settlement to their request. (*Id.*)
13 Defendants state they have paid Plaintiff the agreed upon amount, but Plaintiff's counsel
14 has refused to stipulate to dismissal of the action. (*Id.*) Defendants also request sanctions
15 against Plaintiff's counsel for failure to dismiss the action. (*Id.* at 3–4.)

16
17 Given the parties' dispute, there is no reason for the Court to retain jurisdiction
18 over this matter any longer.¹ Accordingly, the Court **REMANDS** this action to Orange
19 County Superior Court and **DENIES** Defendants' *ex parte* request for dismissal and
20 sanctions.

21
22 DATED: April 11, 2018



24 CORMAC J. CARNEY
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26

27 ¹ The Court had previously determined that it would delay remand until April 20, 2018, unless Judge
28 Scott recommended a later date. But, as evidenced by Defendants' *ex parte* request, further litigation in
federal court is not productive.